

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-18 are presently pending in this case. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 8 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new Claims 9-18 are added by the present amendment. As new Claims 9-18 are supported by the original disclosure,¹ no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, the abstract and specification were objected to; Claims 1, 4, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Saito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,504, hereinafter “Saito”) in view of Ikeda (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020105582); Claims 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Saito in view of Ikeda and further in view of Hunter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,881, hereinafter “Hunter”); and Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Saito in view of Ikeda and further in view of Ogata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,409,601, hereinafter “Ogata”).

Applicants and Applicants’ representatives thank Examiners LaBarr for the courtesy of the interview granted to Applicants’ representatives on July 24, 2007. During the interview, differences between the claims and the cited references were discussed. Examiner LaBarr identified other references he considered pertinent, such as U.S. Patent Nos. 6,583,793 and 5,898,438. Examiner LaBarr agreed to reconsider the rejections of record after formal submission of a response.

With regard to the Article 19 amendment filed with the original application, it is respectfully noted that the publication of the present application included this amendment, and thus this amendment is considered to have been entered. Thus, the present amendment

¹See, e.g., the Article 19 claims, Figure 6, and the specification at page 12, lines 3-8.

cancels Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 8 without prejudice or disclaimer as these claims were pending after the Article 19 amendment was entered.

The abstract is amended herewith to place it in conformance with U.S. practice. The specification is amended to include section headings. No new matter is added. Accordingly, the objection to the abstract and specification is believed to be overcome.

With regard to the outstanding rejections of Claims 1-7, these rejections are moot due to the cancellation of these claims. To the extent Saito and Ikeda are relevant to new Claims 9-18, the following remarks are provided for the examiner's consideration.

New Claim 9 recites in part:

animation display means for causing the display screen to *display an instructional animation indicating operating instructions for performing a desired behavior* of the electronic device main body in which the setup information retained in the setup information retention section is reflected, the animation display means creating the animation by *incorporating image data acquired from the image acquisition section on an associated location in the display section* within the model data stored in the model data storage section.

Saito describes a camera capable of taking both digital pictures and conventional silver pictures.² Saito describes that crystal monitor 40 displays an image equal to the image formed on the film, which is a finder image observed through the optical finder.³ However, it is respectfully submitted that Saito does not describe that crystal monitor 40 displays an instructional animation indicating operating instructions for performing any behavior. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Saito does not teach or suggest “animation display means” as defined in new Claim 9. With regard to Ikeda, Ikeda describes that operation instruction images can be stored a detachable recording medium 28, or the internal memory the camera.⁴ However, Ikeda does not describe that the operation instruction images incorporate image

²See Saito, abstract.

³See Saito, column 6, lines 49-52.

⁴See Ikeda, paragraph 77.

data from the image pickup unit 2 of the camera. Accordingly, Ikeda does not teach or suggest “animation display means” as defined in new Claim 9 either. Finally, it is respectfully submitted that U.S. Patent Nos. 6,583,793 and 5,898,438 also do not teach or suggest “animation display means” as defined in Claim 9. Consequently, new Claim 9 (and Claims 10-12 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Saito in view of Ikeda.

New Claim 13 recites in part:

creating an instructional animation indicating operating instructions for performing the desired behavior of the electronic device main body in which the setup information retained in the setup information retention section is reflected, and causing the display screen to display the instructional animation, *the animation created by incorporating image data acquired from the image acquisition section into an associated location in the display section* within the model data stored in the model data storage section.

As noted above with respect to Claim 1, neither Saito nor Ikeda teach or suggest incorporating image data acquired from an image acquisition section into an instructional animation indicating operating instructions for performing a desired behavior of an electronic device. Accordingly neither Saito nor Ikeda teach or suggest “creating an instructional animation” as defined in new Claim 13. Consequently, new Claim 13 (and Claim 14 dependent therefrom) is also patentable over Saito in view of Ikeda.

New Claim 15 recites in part:

an animation display unit configured to cause the display screen to *display an instructional animation indicating operating instructions for performing a desired behavior of the electronic device main body* in which the setup information retained in the setup information retention unit is reflected, the animation display unit configured to create the animation by performing a process for *incorporating image data acquired from the image acquisition unit on an associated location in the display section* within the model data stored in the model data storage unit.

As noted above, neither Saito nor Ikeda teach or suggest a unit configured to incorporate image data acquired from an image acquisition section into an instructional

Application No. 10/559,662
Reply to Office Action of May 24, 2007

animation indicating operating instructions for performing a desired behavior of an electronic device. Accordingly, neither Saito nor Ikeda teach or suggest “an animation display unit” as defined in new Claim 15. Consequently, new Claim 15 (and Claims 16-18 dependent therefrom) is patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.
An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\ET\281248US\281248US-AMD8.24.07.DOC